



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,453	01/23/2004	An-Sheng Chang	TAIW 207	5481
7590	09/12/2006		EXAMINER	
RABIN & BERDO, P.C. Suite 500 1101 14 Street N.W. Washington, DC 20005				MARTINEZ, DAVID E
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2181

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/762,453	CHANG, AN-SHENG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. Martinez	2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,6,10 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,6,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

FRITZ FLEMING

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

9/7/2006

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3 and 6 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With regards to claims 1 and 6, the term "a signal transmission module connected between a power module and a control module, the control module sending and receiving messages from the host via the signal transmission module" is not supported in the original disclosure. Figure 1 of the instant application only shows the signal transmission module element 18 directly connected to the control module element 12, but fails to show the signal transmission module connected to the power module element 4, i.e. signal transmission module is not connected **between** the power module element 4 and the control module element 12. The detailed description also fails to support such claimed connection.

Claims 1 and 6 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With regards to claims 1 and 6, the term "a signal transmission module connected between a power module and a control module, the control module sending and receiving

messages from the host via the signal transmission module" fails to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make/use the invention. The specification, when describing figure 1, only discloses how the signal transmission module is used to send messages. The specification fails to mention in which manner exactly is the signal transmission module physically coupled within the system and to what particular elements. Furthermore, figure 1 itself only shows the signal transmission module only coupled to the control module. The original disclosure fails to support the cited term, showing something different than what is being claimed, and thus not enabling one of ordinary skill in the art to make the invention.

With regards to claims 2-3 and 10-11, due to their dependency from independent claims 1 and 6 respectively, they inherently suffer from the same deficiencies and thus are rejected under the same rationale.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6,10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,275,946 to Meir in view of US Patent No. 5,565,759 to Dunstan.

1. With regards to claims 1 and 6-8, Meir teaches an interface card [fig 1 element 10] for connection to a host [fig 3 element 22 including element 10] and a power supply module [fig 1 element 16 or fig 3 element 28], the power supply module supplying power to the host, the interface card [fig 1 element 10] comprising:

a power charging module, for connection to the power supply module [fig 1 element 20];

a host power connecting module, for connection to the host [fig 3, 3-pronged connector element where element 30 plugs into that is inside element 10 column 3 lines 4-20];

a power module [fig 1 element 16], connected to the power charging module [fig 1 element 20] and the host power connecting module [fig 3, 3-pronged connector element where element 30 plugs into that is inside element 10 column 3 lines 4-20];

wherein the power module [fig 1 element 16] provides electrical power to the host [fig 3, element 22] when the power supply module is low in capacity [column 2 lines 37-40], and the power module is recharged via the power charging module [column 3 lines 59-62] by the power supply module of the host when the power module is low in capacity [column 2 lines 9-20 and column 4 lines 11-14 – charging through the pc slot, or charging from an electrical outlet which could also be a power supply module to the host].

Meir teaches all of the above limitation as well as a control module detecting a power state of both the power module and the power supply module [column 1 lines 15-22], and sending a warning message to a user – not to the host - when the power module and the external power source are found to be abnormal [column 5 lines 39-47]. Meir is silent as to sending a warning message to a host when either one of the power module and the external power source is low in capacity and a signal transmission module connected to a control module, the control module sending and receiving messages from the host via the signal transmission module. However, Dunstan teaches sending a message to a host to warn a user about potentially dangerous situation for the benefit of having the user rectify those potentially dangerous situations [column 8 lines 45-53] and a signal transmission module [must have a sending module inside fig 3 element 34 for sending messages to host element 30] connected to a control module [control module inside figure 3 element 34 - controlling the sending/receiving of

messages to host element 30 based on some conditional situation, some control element must evaluate the situation before sending a message], the control module sending and receiving messages from the host via the signal transmission module also for the benefit of having the user rectify those potentially dangerous situations [column 8 lines 45-53].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both Meir and Dunstan to send a warning message to a host when either of the power module and the power supply module is low in capacity and to have a signal transmission module connected to a control module, the control module sending and receiving messages from the host via the signal transmission module for the benefit of having the user rectify potentially dangerous situations.

2. With regards to claims 2 and 10, Meir teaches the connection between the interface card and the host can be through any PC slot [column 1 lines 15-22] and mentions the PCI slot () being one of the options [column 5 lines 6-11]. Meir is silent as to the interface card of claim 1, wherein the connection between the interface card and the host uses an ISA bus. However, the ISA bus is well known in the art to be used by legacy systems to communicate with peripheral devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Meir and those that were well known, to allow the internal card and the host to use an ISA bus to communicate, for the benefit of being able to support legacy systems.

3. With regards to claims 3 and 11, Meir teaches the interface card of claim 1, wherein the connection between the interface card and the host uses a PCI bus [column 5 lines 6-11].

***Response to Arguments***

Upon further review for allowance, Examiner reviewed the record and discovered the configuration of previously presented claims 17 and 18 whose subject matter is now amended into claims 1 and 6 respectively, pertains to new matter introduced on 5/30/06. Upon review of said response (dated 5/30/06), it is noted the Applicant didn't provide specific support in the original disclosure for the amended limitation. The allowability of claims 1 and 6 is vacated in view of the lack of support by the original disclosure. Please see the rejections above.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Martinez whose telephone number is (571) 272-4152. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fritz M. Fleming can be reached on 571-272-4145. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fritz m. Fleming

FRITZ FLEMING  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

9/7/2006